



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/736,698	12/17/2003	Lan Chen	246696US90	5689
22850	7590	10/25/2007		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER VIANA DI PRISCO, GERMAN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2619	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/25/2007	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com  
oblonpat@oblon.com  
jgardner@oblon.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 10/736,698	Applicant(s) CHEN ET AL.	
	Examiner German Viana Di Prisco	Art Unit 2619	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 August 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claim 1, 3, 5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Itoh et al (United States Patent Application Publication No.: US 2006/0205358 A1) in view of Franchi et al (European Patent Application Publication No.: EP 1 381 180 A1).

Consider claims 1, 3, 5 and 7 Itoh et al disclose a packet communications system and method for carrying out packet communications between a base station 2 and a mobile station 1<sub>1</sub> located in an area controlled by the base station, the system and method comprising: a base station 2 and a mobile station 1<sub>1</sub> comprising a channel quality detecting unit (Receiving Quality Judging Unit 21 in figure 3 and Receiving Quality Estimation Unit 50 in figure 8) for detecting a channel quality between the base station and the mobile station; and a modulation scheme determination unit (Adaptive Modulation and Coding Unit 14 in figure 3 and modulation unit 52 in figure 8) for determining a modulation scheme to be used in the packet communications based on the channel quality and the buffered data amount (figure 1 and paragraph [0108]).

However Itoh et al do not specifically disclose a buffered data monitoring unit that monitors and detects the amount of data buffered in a transmission buffer of a sender.

In the same field of endeavor Franchi et al inherently teach a buffered data monitoring unit because the modulation scheme may be varied according to the amount of data buffered for transmission (paragraph [0004]).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to detect the amount of data buffered in a transmission buffer of a sender in order to efficiently vary the modulation scheme.

5. Claims 2, 4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Itoh et al (United States Patent Application Publication No.: US 2006/0205358 A1) in view of Franchi et al (European Patent Application Publication No.: EP 1 381 180 A1) as applied to claims 1,3, and 5 above, and further in view of Alastalo (United States Patent No.: 6,721,302 B1).

Consider claims 2,4, and 6 and as applied to claims 1, 3, and 5 respectively above, Itoh et al. as modified by Franchi et al. disclose the claimed invention but fail to specifically disclose that padding, which is added to the data buffered in the transmission buffer of the sender when the buffered data amount is less than a transmission unit size, becomes the minimum, based on the channel quality and the buffered data amount.

In the same field of endeavor Alastalo discloses reducing the amount of padding, which is added to the data buffered in the transmission buffer of the sender when the buffered data amount is less than a transmission unit size (data which is of a lesser length than the longest length data transmission is thereby determined), by selecting the modulation type based on the channel quality (received signal strength) and the

buffered data amount (determination is made of the lengths of the data packets to be communicated), (column 3 lines 1-43).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to minimize padding based on the channel quality and the buffered data amount as disclosed by Alastalo in the method of Itoh et al as modified by Franchi et al. in order to obtain a larger throughput.

***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

***Conclusion***

7. Any response to this Office Action should be **faxed to** (571) 273-8300 **or mailed to**:

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**Hand-delivered responses** should be brought to

Customer Service Window  
Randolph Building  
401 Dulany Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to German Viana Di Prisco whose telephone number is (571) 270-1781. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:30-5:00 EST.

Art Unit: 2619

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ken Vanderpuye can be reached on (571) 272-3078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

*German Viana Di Prisco*  
October 15, 2007



KENNETH VANDERPUYE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER